REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks.

Claims 6-9 were pending in this application. Claims 6-8 had been amended and new claims 10-12 have been added hereby. Support for the amendment and new claims can be found in, e.g., Figure 1, page 2, lines 7-14, and page 3, lines 22-24 of the present specification. No new matter has been presented. Upon entry of this Amendment, claims 6-12 will be pending herein and, for the reasons set forth below, are all believed to be in condition for allowance.

In the Office Action,

- Claims 6-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ormson (US 7,433,709) in view of Hsieh (US 7,260,068.)

This ground of rejection is respectfully traversed.

Amended claim 6 and new claim 10 recite a wireless communications network participant that operates using only one clock that generates a single timing or clock signal. That timing or clock signal is employed by one or several subsystems where, in at least one instance, the timing or clock signal is supplied to a scheduler that is configured to send commands to at least one of the subsystems (e.g. a GSM subsystem) for its or their operation and where the scheduler receives the timing or clock signal and deduces the timing of the commands relative to the timing or clock signal.

Ormson discloses a mobile radio communications device having a first crystal oscillator for providing a first master clock frequency for a timebase of a first communication system, a second crystal oscillator for providing a second master clock frequency for a timebase of a second communication system, a third oscillator for providing a relatively low frequency clock signal within the device, and means for calibrating each of the first and second master clocks on the basis of respective measurements of the first and second master clocks to the relatively low frequency clock signal.

The technical features required by independent claims 6 and 10 are not disclosed by Ormson (or Hsieh).

Specifically, a first distinguishing feature between the present invention and Ormson is the use of **a single clock.** In comparing the invention and Ormson, it is clear the present application relates to a wireless communications network participant using a single clock (see, e.g., page 2, lines 7-14, page 3, lines 22-24 and Figs. 1 and 3), while the mobile radio communications device in Ormson **has three clocks**, i.e., **a first crystal oscillator** for providing a first master clock frequency for a timebase of a first communication system, **a second crystal oscillator** for providing a second master clock frequency for a timebase of a second communication system, and **a third oscillator** for providing a relatively low frequency clock signal within the device (see Fig. 1 and col. 4, lines 8-20 of Ormson).

A second distinguishing feature between the present invention and Ormson is that the invention advantageously permits a **single timing signal** within the wireless communication network participant to be used for interacting with networks organized according to different standards so that **separate timing signals do not need to be generated for use with different standards**. Moreover, where the wireless communications network participant switches from interacting with a network organized according to one standard to interacting with a network organized according to another standard, the use of a single timing signal **allows the switchover to be implemented efficiently** as the timings required under the different standards are calculated relative to the same clock signal.

In light of the foregoing, it is quite clear that Ormson fails to disclose or to suggest expressly claimed features of the present invention and, while Hsieh discloses a "scheduler 84," the reference fails to cure the deficiencies of Ormson noted above. Consequently, Applicant respectfully requests that the §103(a) rejections of the claims based on the cited prior art of record be reconsidered and withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing all of the claims in this case are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions or determine that any further action is

desirable to place this application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Dated: February 4, 2009

Respectfully submitted by:

/Lawrence D. Eisen/

Lawrence D. Eisen
Reg. No. 41009

EDELL, SHAPIRO & FINNAN, LLC
CUSTOMER NO. 27896
1901 Research Boulevard, Suite 400
Rockville, MD 20850
(301) 424-3640